

**REMARKS**

The Official Action mailed April 14, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for Continued Examination*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 5, 2001; February 12, 2004; June 24, 2005 (resubmitted July 25, 2005); August 15, 2005; and December 17, 2007.

Claims 1-18, 37-54, 73-90, 109-126 and 145-188 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 10, 37, 46, 73, 82, 109, 118, 145, 152, 159, 166 and 185-188 are independent. Claims 1, 10, 37, 46, 73, 82, 109, 118, 145, 152, 159, 166 and 185-188 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action rejects claims 1-9, 37-45, 145-151, 173 and 181 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,003 to Kwon and U.S. Patent No. 5,850,204 to Maekawa. Paragraph 4 of the Official Action rejects claims 10-18, 46-54, 73-90, 109-126, 152-172, 174, 176-180 and 182-188 as obvious based on the combination of Kwon, U.S. Patent No. 5,574,475 to Callahan and Maekawa. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or


references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some reason to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Claims 1, 37 and 145 have been amended to clarify the features of the present invention. Specifically, claims 1, 37 and 145 have been amended to recite a current source configured to decide whether a current is outputted or not by the signal from the shift register. Also, the claims have also been amended to remove features which are not believed to be critical to the patentability of the claims. Further, independent claims 10, 46, 73, 82, 109, 118, 152, 159, 166 and 185-188 have been amended in a manner similar to claims 1, 37 and 145. For the reasons provided below, Kwon, Callahan and Maekawa, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

The Official Action concedes that Kwon fails to teach "where the current source [is] configured such that supplying a current to said level shifter is controlled based on the pulse from the shift register" (page 3, Paper No. 20080319). The Official Action asserts that "Maekawa teaches a current source which supplies a current to said level shifter on input of a pulse" (Id.). However, Maekawa does not teach or suggest a current source configured to decide whether a current is outputted or not by the signal from the shift register. Rather, the current source I of Maekawa outputs a current to an

element  $N_9$  regardless of an output signal of a shift register (Figure 5 reproduced below).

FIG. 5



Even if one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention had sufficient reason to combine Kwon and Maekawa, the resulting combination would not teach or suggest the features of the present invention. Specifically, Kwon and Maekawa do not teach or suggest a current source configured to decide whether a current is outputted or not by the signal from the shift register. Also, Kwon and Maekawa do not teach or suggest that Maekawa should be modified to include a current source configured to decide whether a current is outputted or not by the signal from the shift register.


Callahan does not cure the deficiencies in Kwon and Maekawa. Callahan is relied upon to allegedly teach a source signal line driving circuit composed of signal drivers and a gate line driver composed of a plurality of gate drivers, and the usage of a decoder included in the source signal line driving circuit for outputting pulses  $n$  in accordance with input singals (page 6, Paper No. 20080319). However, Kwon, Callahan and Maekawa, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the following features or that Kwon and Maekawa should be modified to include the

following features: a current source configured to decide whether a current is outputted or not by the signal from the shift register.

Since Kwon, Callahan and Maekawa do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
PMB 955  
21010 Southbank Street  
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165  
(571) 434-6789